

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action, and the following remarks are presented for the Examiner's consideration.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller, U.S. Patent No. 5,061,923 in view of Will, U.S. Pat. No. 5,825,353.

Claim 1 has been amended to further distinguish over the prior art. Claims 3 and 4 have been canceled.

Neither Miller, Will nor the combination thereof teach all the limitations of amended claim 1. More specifically, neither Miller, Will nor the combination thereof teach "an input cancellation unit for canceling a single input digit of the identification information by rotating the dial unit in a reversed direction."

Regarding Miller, the Examiner admitted in rejecting claim 1 that Miller does not teach a cancellation unit.

Regarding Will, in column 8, lines 18-21 Will discloses a backspace function to move the cursor one position to the previous position for the purpose of deleting the previous character. Column 8, lines 31-32 of Will, however, discloses that the text can be edited by pressing "Bksp" (backspace) to remove the last character, see Fig. 8c. Thus, Will does not teach cancelling a single input by rotating a dial in a reversed direction but rather teaches pressing a backspace function to cancel an input. Therefore, Will does not teach all the limitations of amended claim 1.

Regarding the combination, Applicant notes that there must be a basis in the art for combining references. Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive

supporting the combination. *ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hospital*, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The Examiner must be able to point to something in the prior art that suggests in some way a combination with another reference in order to arrive at the claimed invention. Here, the Examiner attempts to combine a combination lock of Miller with a personal digital assistant having a backspace function, as described above, of Will. First of all, combination locks and PDAs are completely unrelated. Therefore, any suggestion to combine these diverse technologies should be clear from the teachings of the art. This is not the case in these references. In particular Miller provides no suggestion at all to use a backspace function. Referring to column 6, lines 9–13, Miller discloses when a match is made between the stored combination and the dialed code the safe will open. This implies that when an incorrect code is entered the safe will not open and the operator will have to enter the code from starting from the beginning. Further, Miller is silent as to implementing any type of function that would allow the operator to correct the code while the operator is entering it. Miller fails to suggest that correcting or editing a code during the entry process is necessary or desired. Thus, Miller provides no motivation for one skilled in the art to look for an apparatus, such as the one disclosed in Will, to provide a backspace function. Therefore, the Examiner improperly combined the combination lock of Miller with the PDA backspace function of Will.


Claims 2, 6 and 7 depend from claim 1, thus, all arguments pertaining to claim 1 are equally applicable to these claims and are herein incorporated by reference.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appln. No. 09/917,986
Amdt. dated April 26, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated January 31, 2006

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same
to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33837.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Aaron A. Fishman – Reg. No. 44,682

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: April 26, 2006